

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,510	03/30/2004	Stephen J. Petti	2098.003	3250
5 COLUMBIA		EXAMINER WARE, DEBORAH K		
ALBANY, NY	NY 12203		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

· ×	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/812,510	PETTI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Deborah K. Ware	1651			
The MAILING DATE of this communication					
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILII - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicate. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNION CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r ion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON y statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>13 June 2007</u> .				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice un	nder <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims		•			
4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-11 is/are pending in the day of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	thdrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)∑		· ·			
Applicant may not request that any objection	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the call 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the call 11 including the call 11.	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E	uments have been received. uments have been received in A e priority documents have been	pplication No			
* See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certified copies not	received.			
	-0.				
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)			
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 			

Art Unit: 1651

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 are presented for examination on the merits.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 13, 2007, has been entered. The amendment filed June 13, 2007, has been received and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 1651

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernd Elger et al, cited on enclosed PTO-1449 Form, in view of Schwartz et al (US 5523292), cited on enclosed PTO-892 Form.

Claims are drawn to a method for treating stroke in a patient by administering ancrod intravenously at varied time intervals and in effective amounts, therefore.

Elger et al (Elger) teach a method for treating stroke in a patient by administering ancrod intravenously at varied time intervals and in effective amounts, therefore. Note page 895, summary section.

Schwartz et al (Schwartz) teach a method for preventing restenosis by administering ancrod intravenously at varied time intervals and in effective amounts, therefore. Note col. 2, lines 54-67 and col. 3-4, lines 1-20. Also note col. 6, line 60.

The claims differ from Elger in that the specific time intervals and effective amounts are not disclosed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to treat stroke with ancrod as disclosed by Elger by selecting for the time intervals and effective amounts which have proven efficient in preventing restenosis which is also related to the onset of stroke in a patient. Clearly with successful dosages and time intervals taught by Schawrtz one of skill would have expected successful results for treating stroke as ancrod is known to be effective but the

Art Unit: 1651

amounts disclosed by Schwartz would have motivated one of skill to select and administer these amounts to a stroke patient as well for treatment therefore.

The identical effective range amounts are disclosed by Schwartz and for one of skill to glean what has already been performed in the art for one disease is clearly an obvious moficiation of the cited prior art. Each of the claim features are disclosed by Schwartz but he is not treating stroke per se. One of skill would have expected that the amounts would work because the same identical compound is useful to treat stroke patients. Further, the amounts administered by Applicants' claimed methods are disclosed by Schawartz to be generally known in the art, note col. 2, lines 65-67. In the absence of persuasive evidence to the contrary the claims are prima facie obvious.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 13, 2007, have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive. The argument that Elger does not teach the claimed range is noted, however, at page 897, column 1, lines 1-10, the reference does clearly suggest that positive results have been obtained for decreasing fibrinogen levels within the range from above 1 IU kg/hour to about 10 IU kg/hour. Thus, while reduction in lesions is not discussed a reduction of fibrinogen levels is clearly described with the claimed range. Therefore, one of skill would have expected to be able to achieve initial defibrinogenation as claimed. Ancrod is well known to cleave fibrinogen leading to rapid defibrinogenation, as disclosed by Elger. Further, the instants claims do not require a reduction in lesion volume on the brain but a reduction in fibrinogen levels via administering a defibrinogenating agent.

Art Unit: 1651

Elger combined with Schwartz clearly does disclose capability at lower dosage concentration rates. The second argument that animal studies do not translate well to human studies of ischemic stroke is noted, however, the disclosed treatment schedule followed by Elger included administering ancrod 30 minutes after middle cerebral artery occlusion. Thus, there is at least a suggestion, if not a teaching, Elger does not require a 24 hour obversation period before beginning treatment via administration of ancrod to a potential patient. Animal models are often used to determine treatment regimens for humans.

Regarding the arguments directed at the teachings of Schwartz it should be noted that the ranges are within the range as claimed because 1 to 3 Units kg includes 1.25 Units per kg as claimed herein. Also as noted above ancrod is known to rapidly lower fibrinogen levels and hence this effect is intrinsic. Furthermore, there is overlap between the range disclosed by Elger and that disclosed by Schawartz. Each of the claimed process steps are either disclosed or are intrinsic to the processes of the cited prior art, as for example a ceasing of administration of the agent will intrinsically allow for normalization of fibrinogen levels to occur due to a leveling off effect after initial defribinogenation. The claims are prima facie obvious over the cited prior art for these reasons.

All claims fail to be patentably distinguishable over the state of the art discussed above and cited on the previously enclosed PTO-892 and/or PTO-1449. Therefore, the claims are properly rejected.

Art Unit: 1651

The remaining references listed on the previously enclosed PTO-892 and/or PTO-1449 are cited to further show the state of the art.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah K. Ware whose telephone number is 571-272-0924. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Deborah K. Ware September 1, 2007